Exhibit 5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

****

IN RE: BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORP.,
PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEMS PRODUCTS
LIABILITY LITIGATION MDL NO. 2366

This Document Relates to All
Cases

****

DEPOSITION OF STEPHEN H. SPIEGELBERG, PH.D.

Wednesday, January 14th, 2015
9:30 a.m.

Held At:
Murphy & Riley, PC
101 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts

REPORTED BY:
Maureen O'Connor Pollard, RMR, CLR, CSR

Q. Can you tell me?

A. The black specks that I observed in the meshes were not black specks per se, as in terms of inclusions, rather were just reflections that are often inherent in circular surfaces.

Q. And did you perform independent testing to verify that?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And could you describe that to me?

A. You take the mesh and place it in an optical microscope, and then rotate the mesh under the optical microscope and see if the black specks move or disappear, which they did.

Q. Did you produce any photographs or methods relating to the method and the conclusions that you just described?

A. No.

Q. So I read the report and I didn't see -- I didn't see any reference to you doing that testing. Is that in there?

A. No, it's not in there.

Q. Was the examination that you did, was that performed after your report was submitted?

A. No, it was not.

Q. So you did the examination. So at some point you learned that Plaintiffs' experts had mentioned that they saw black specks under microscopic examination, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And then after you heard about the black specks, you took it upon yourself to try to perform the same thing that Plaintiffs' experts did?

A. I don't know if it's the same thing that they did, but I did a microscopic examination of the meshes.

Q. Did you review the photographs -- and this is Dr. Dunn, is that right?

A. I believe so.

Q. Did you unravel the mesh at all and then look at it under the microscope?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And for this examination that you did on black specks?

A. Yes.

Q. So you took the -- you undid the knit, and you actually saw little strands of polypropylene that had come undone?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And you examined them under a microscope, and you saw no black specks?

A. I saw the black specks come and go depending on the orientation I held them in the microscope.

Q. And did you take it upon yourself to cut open the monofilament and actually confirm that there were no black specks in there?

A. Can you explain a little bit more what you mean?

Q. Sure.

So under a microscope, if you've unravelled the mesh and you see the monofilament there, so this is a monofilament mesh and I assume you were looking at -- I'm sorry, can you tell me what kind of mesh you were looking at?

A. It was monofilament.

Q. It was a monofilament.

Was it the Advantage, or the Polyform?

A. This would have been the Polyform.

Q. And this was Polyform that had been supplied to you by the Defendant?

A. Yes.

Q. And so you grabbed a sample the size of a stamp?

A. Approximately. A little bit smaller.
Q. Smaller than a stamp.
And you did your examination of the size of the stamp first and then you unravelled, or how did it go?
A. Exactly that way.
Q. Okay. And in both cases, the black specks came and went with the light, is that right?
A. That's correct, with the orientation.
Q. With the orientation of the mesh?
A. That's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, when I talk about cutting the mesh, what I'm referring to is you see a black speck, you cut through the monofilament where the black speck shows up, and do you then look at it head-on and confirm that there is no black speck in the middle of the monofilament? Was that done?
A. No, it was not.
Q. What's the significance of -- is there any significance at all to the idea that Dr. Dunn saw black specks in these meshes?
A. I believe Dr. Dunn was seeing the same thing I saw, that it's due to reflection of

black objects in the room rather than actual inherent black specks due to processing.

Q. Do you know this mesh, this Polyform mesh that you have, do you know what the lot number was on it?

A. It would have been the same lot number as reflected in my reports, the case-specific testing.

Q. Okay. So the case-specific testing that you did for this wave 1 and wave 2, that you were supplied Polyform mesh for that, is that right?

A. I was previously supplied Polyform mesh, yes.

Q. Okay. And did that Polyform mesh come from an Uphold, or was it just Polyform mesh?

A. It was just Polyform mesh.

Q. So you were supplied that in 2013?

A. I don't recall if it was 2013 or 2014, but...

Q. So previously. So for your previous report, you don't know if for your previous report you were supplied Polyform, or were you given it recently, or --

A. It was a while ago.

Q. Okay. So in your report, in the case-specific section of your report, there's going to be a reference to the lot number of Polyform that you examined?

A. That's correct.

Q. And no photographs were taken, right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Do you have the mesh that you cut into a square still?

A. I've got the same overall piece of mesh, I do, yes.

Q. So you have the same overall piece of mesh, but you don't -- do you have the unravelled bits of mesh that you had?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Did you take into account any, say -- let's call it the incidence or the reflective angle that polypropylene might have on your light?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. So I may have just used the wrong terminology completely. But you know how when you look into a pond and you think a fish is in front of you, but it's actually at a different angle than it is because of the way light

reflects through water?

A. Refracts.

Q. Refracts through water. Did I use the word -- I used it correctly, I think, the first time. The second time I said reflects.

So did you take that into account when you did your examination of the black specks?

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And how did you do that?

A. Again, by orienting the sample and rotating it. That's exactly what's happening, you're changing the angle of reflection. I can also demonstrate that I could reproduce the presence of the black speck by taking a piece of monofilament polypropylene not related to Polyform that shows no black specks, and by putting a slight indent on the surface of it I could create a black speck or flatten it, which was changing the curvature of the fiber.

Q. Are you aware, did you perform this examination with, say, an AMS product?

A. No, I did not.

Q. So just the Polyform mesh that you have?

A. That's correct.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Okay. Did you have a chance to review the photographs, the microscopic photographs taken by Dr. Dunn in this case?

A. I did see some of them, yes.

Q. And is it your testimony that none of those photographs had black specks along, you know, non-curved portions of the mesh?

A. I don't recall seeing from his. I know from my own examination.

Q. So your own examination is that you saw the black specks in the curvature of the mesh and not in the straightaways?

A. That's correct.

Q. Okay. Do you teach any classes related to polypropylene mesh, Doctor?

A. No, I do not.

Q. Do you teach any classes related to polypropylene?

A. I've given lectures on polyolefins and polypropylene as part of that discussion.

Q. Ever discuss polypropylene mesh?

A. I don't recall doing it, no.

Q. I'm looking at your time and expense detail, and it goes back to December 5th. Is

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. And then rinsing it with more -- after it was decanted and rinsed with more hexane, same purpose?

A. Just removing any residual, yes.

Q. Do you know, does hexane react with polypropylene?

A. It does not.

Q. Do you know, does hexane react with any of the enzymes associated with tissue ingrowth or collagen formation on implantable medical devices?

A. I don't know.

Q. Can you tell me what you do know about collagen formation on implantable medical devices?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. Not very much, no.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Do you know if there is, in human collagen, if there is a ratio of carbon to oxygen that is present in human collagen?

A. Well, the chemistry of it is well described, and there would be a specific ratio.

Q. As a chemical engineer, is this

something you've looked at in the past?

A. We have in the past. I don't remember it currently, but we worked in the area of collagen in the past.

Q. Are you also aware that there is a specific ratio of carbon to nitrogen in human collagen?

A. Yes.

Q. And are you -- this is a math question. Are you also aware that there is a ratio of nitrogen to oxygen in human collagen?

A. Yes.

Q. Did you use this knowledge in forming your opinions in this case?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Was there any literature that you looked to in forming your opinions in this case?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. In regard to the ratios of carbon nitrogen to oxygen that are present in human collagen?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. No, I did not.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

A. No.

Q. Did you know if any of these women had mesh removed for erosions?

A. No.

Q. You knew nothing about the specific medical conditions of any of these women?

A. That's correct.

Q. Except for the fact that at some point in time they had mesh implanted, is that right?

A. Implanted and explanted.

Q. Implanted and explanted. Okay.

How does the hexane soak work to remove fatty acids?

A. Acids tend to be soluble in hexane. So what you're making use of is basically the partition coefficient of the extraction process, that the fatty acids would prefer to be in hexane over being in the polypropylene.

Q. So it's a diffusion reaction, is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. So wouldn't there be a point where we just got to equilibrium and there would be as much fatty acid in the solution as there was in the mesh?

A. We -- because I used an abundance of hexane, so in other words a lot more hexane than they could possibly -- flip that around.

The concentration of fatty acid in the hexane solution should never get to the point that it would match what's in the polypropylene.

Q. And what's the purpose of -- and, frankly, do you have any literature that says that polypropylene is going to be -- polypropylene mesh is going to be absorbing fatty acids?

A. Clavé speaks to that a bit in his paper, but it's well-known that implantable polyolefins in general will absorb fatty acids and things like squalene and cholesterol. There's been publications on that.

Q. And those would be sort of bloodborne absorptions to the mesh? How would they come in contact with the mesh? That's my question.

A. The fact that the mesh is in contact with fat, muscle, just basic biological tissue, those will all contain components of fatty acids, amides, proteins, etcetera.

Q. And when you refer to Clavé, you're referring to one of his three hypothesis on -- I

don't even know, one of the three things that he described in his paper?

A. Yes. He identifies absorbed fatty acids or absorbed biological materials in his FTIR.

Q. He identified absorbed biological materials in his FTIR?

A. Yes.

Q. And how did he do that?

A. He described that the hydroxyl group formation and the carbonyl formation was due to biological material.

Q. Okay. I'm not ready to talk about that, because we didn't actually talk about the -- we did talk about the methods that you use regarding XPS and EDS, and the difference between the two of them. But as far -- and we discussed the microscopy, and we described the FTIR as being standard.

FTIR, is that a bulk measurement, or is that a surface measurement?

A. It can be either.

Q. Okay. In the case of what you performed -- the FTIR that you performed on these -- per this protocol, what was it, a bulk,

zoom into high magnification for features.

Q. So when I'm talking about -- I'm talking about a specific area. And you've already testified that there are other SEM images. Did you take an SEM image of every square of the sample, or did you just choose separate areas to take SEM images?

A. Our process is to first do a survey scan, just move around the sample just to get an idea of what the topology or morphology looks like on the sample, and then to capture representative images of those areas.

Q. Okay. And same question regarding protocol, but this time for EDS. How were the EDS sites chosen?

A. In this case, we were looking for areas that had visual cracking on the surfaces to identify what was the nature of the cracking or what was the elemental composition.

Q. And do you know how far down into each sample you went with the EDS?

A. Well, the EDS is a surface analysis. And the -- so based on the accelerated voltage that we're using, it will be the first few microns.

Q. Could that differ between report, or is that something that you would just have been -- it would have been standardized throughout all reports?

A. Standardized.

Q. Okay. And so just so I'm clear, the SEMs -- we have broad sweeps of SEMs that were taken of each sample, is that correct?

A. Not necessarily images collected, just viewed.

Q. Okay. So images weren't collected, they were viewed?

A. They are viewed, that's correct. And then we collect representative images, which are reflected in this report, or these reports.

Q. Okay. So for each report, every SEM image that you took would have been produced in that report?

A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. And for each report, the EDS that you took, you looked for areas that had surface cracking, and then you took an EDS reading?

A. In general that was the protocol, yes.

Q. Why did you choose that protocol?

A. I wanted to identify or ascertain what

was the nature -- what was cracking off the surface, was it polypropylene, was it the adhered biological material.

Q. Why not perform EDS on an area that seemed relatively clean?

A. I believe I did that in some of the cases as well.

Q. Did you do that in all the cases where you had EDS?

A. No, I did not.

Q. Are there EDS readings that haven't been produced for each Plaintiff, do you know?

A. I don't believe so, no.

Q. So this is a protocol that you created?

A. It's one that we use when we're looking at explanted samples. It was developed over time in my laboratory.

Q. When you say "we," you're referring to -- what are you referring to?

A. Cambridge Polymer Group.

Q. And even though you'd given me the reference, the de Tayrac reference, the ultrasonic bath, that's something that you had in place prior to de Tayrac published?

A. Not the combination of DMSO and ultrasonically, but individually we've used both of those to clean explants.

Q. So the EDS, those samples weren't randomized, correct?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. I'm not sure I understand.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. So for each Plaintiff-specific opinion that you've given on EDS, you actually chose the spot where the EDS reading would be taken, is that right?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. And in some instances, you have two spectra for Plaintiffs, is that right, per Plaintiff? Is that right?

A. I believe that's right.

Q. In some instances there's only one spectra collected?

A. That's correct.

Q. And to the best of your ability, you removed as much -- if there were any fatty acids absorbed, you removed them with the hexane, is that right?

A. Well, to the best of my ability to

something else. Is it your understanding that it's not calcium stearate that's in there?

A. It's DHT.

You're talking about the acid scavenger.

Q. The acid scavenger, I'm not. I'm talking about a surfactant? It's something for --

MR. PRATT: Which point are you talking about now?

MR. BOWMAN: It's in the latest report. We don't need to talk about it, I just wanted to -- what I wanted to do was -- let me just -- can I strike the last question? Thank you.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. So there are three acid scavengers, is your understanding, and none of them would have been pulled out by the hexane?

A. There is one hexane scavenger, as I understand.

Q. I meant that.

There's one acid scavenger and there are two antioxidants?

A. That's correct.

Q. Those are the three that you don't think would be pulled out by the hexane, is that right?

A. I'm not certain, actually. That's not something I looked into in this case.

Q. And what about the -- what about those products specifically, do they react with potassium hydroxide?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Do you know the molecular composition of all three of those additives?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. I do.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. And in response to my question regarding hexane, in response to my question regarding potassium hydroxide, have you done the chemistry involved and said you don't understand -- that's not your understanding that those two products will react with these additives?

A. There should be no reaction with them.

Q. Okay. Now, is that because they're not on the surface of the mesh, or is that because they are non-reactive?

carbonyls in either of the controls, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. You're not registering any fatty acids in either of the controls, is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. Are you seeing any of the antioxidants in either of the controls?

A. We probably wouldn't pick up the antioxidants because they're at such low concentration.

Q. Even with this crystal method that you employed?

A. Yes.

Q. So can you tell me what is at the peak between 2750 and 2700?

A. Sorry, say those numbers again?

Q. 2750 and 2700.

A. That's either a methylene group or a methyl group.

Q. And as far as I can tell, that peak is the exact same in both controls. Do you see that?

A. Yeah. There's a little bit difference in height, but the height is a relative thing.

spoke about a baseline with reference to the two pristine samples, correct?

A. Yes, we did.

Q. Now we're talking about a separate baseline that would be used to compare the two pristine samples. Please explain.

A. No. Each sample, each spectra has a baseline, has its own unique baseline, what is effectively zero absorbance. And that baseline can move up at lower wave numbers, as we see in this particular sample. So if we were -- if I were to have baseline corrected this spectra, there would be no departure around 1750 as you were observing. It would be flat there.

Q. Okay. But for the purposes of this report, your conclusion is that no oxidation peak was observed in this area, correct?

A. That's correct.

Q. But you're also saying that if a baseline had been created, that I would see nothing there?

A. It would be -- the baseline correction wouldn't have changed my opinion. It's just it would be -- for someone who doesn't look at FTIR on a daily basis, it would be absolutely clear

to you.

Q. Okay. And you also reference minor peaks between 17 and 1500.

Do you see that?

A. Yes, I do.

Q. And you say that these are associated with Amide I and Amide II?

A. Yes.

Q. Which are found in proteins, correct?

A. Yes, that's correct.

Q. Did you do any analysis to -- specific to this case that would have confirmed that?

A. Not specific to this case, no.

Q. So when we talked about Amide I and Amide II, we're talking about nitrogen-containing proteins, essentially?

A. Well, nitrogen-containing compounds, proteins would be one.

Q. But in this area between 1700 and 1500, are there other things that could show up on FTIR in this area?

A. There are other things, but those -- the peaks, particularly with something that's been explanted, that's where amides will always come out.

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. No.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. The potassium hydroxide is only going to attack the amide groups, is that right?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. I don't know if it's even reacting with the amide groups. It dissolving the polypropylene -- I'm sorry. It's dissolving the biological material that's there which, you know, may not be effectively cleaving in bonds within the proteins, but just causing it to dissociate.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Dissociate with what?

A. From each other.

Q. Okay. And you already testified that there's no way there could possibly be any bonds between an amide group, any kind of amide group and the polypropylene that is the Boston Scientific polypropylene, correct?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. No. I said that there's no rational chemical reaction between polypropylene and any protein that might be present in the material.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Okay. And that includes the antioxidants?

A. That's correct.

Q. So the antioxidants are not going to react with any collagen, with any protein, with anything that comes into contact with this mesh over the lifetime of its implantation?

A. Well, if any of those have a free radical, the antioxidant may donate proton to those free radicals.

Q. So the antioxidant is going to donate a proton whenever it can, correct?

A. Well, if it's in sufficient proximity to one.

Q. But you're also testifying that there are no free radicals in this potassium hydroxide solution, correct?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. And no free radicals are created between the reaction of the potassium hydroxide and the protein that's being dissolved, is that right?

A. Say that question again, please?

Q. No free radicals are being created in

the reaction between the potassium hydroxide and the amide groups that are being dissolved?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. Did you specifically investigate that?

A. No. That wasn't important to me in this case.

Q. Well, if they did create free radicals, wouldn't that be important to you in this case?

A. No, it would not.

Q. Why not?

A. Because you're removing tissue on the outside, you're not allowing those species to go back into the polypropylene. We're just looking at adherent tissue on the outside of the polypropylene.

Q. But you -- it's a soak. You soaked it for a week in the solution, right?

A. Yes.

Q. So if free radicals were created, they could react with the surface of the polypropylene?

A. It's unlikely for that to happen.

Q. They could react with the antioxidants in the polypropylene?

A. Again, doubtful. You're talking about things that are only proximal to the surface, and you have to have intimate molecular contact for that to occur.

Q. More intimate that being in a vial for a week with sodium -- with potassium hydroxide?

A. Yes. We're talking on the molecular level, not just sitting next to each other in a vial.

Q. So your testimony regarding this FTIR spectra is that even though you did investigate the possible reaction creation of free radicals with the amide groups and the potassium hydroxide, that shift still would not have occurred with this carbonyl?

A. That's correct, which is why this cleaning technique is recommended in an ASTM 561, because we're looking for explanted plastic devices.

Q. Polypropylene is probably the most reactive plastic out there, isn't it?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. No.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Is there something that's more

Q. Either by tweezers, or by who knows?
A. Correct.
MR. PRATT: Object to form.
BY MR. BOWMAN:
Q. Now, when you -- could you have done that?
A. As I said, I handled these carefully. I used a plastic tweezers, which shouldn't affect the polypropylene. I tried to be careful with them. It's possible that there were spots that I did have contact, but I was always contacting the end of the samples, so I don't believe that I affected that.
Q. So the conclusions that you've drawn in all of these cases where you say it is qualitatively compliant, the qualitative compliance is based on your handling with tweezers in open air?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you would then compare that with the pristine washed mesh?
A. That's correct. Or the never-washed mesh as well.
Q. I keep saying the same thing -- I think we're saying the same thing.

that are associated with just the surface of these monofilaments, right?

A. Sure.

Q. And if only 10 percent of the surface -- let's say 1 percent of the surface of the area that was examined under FTIR, had hydroxyl groups, would that show up on the FTIR?

A. You can typically pick up around, with all these techniques, around .5 to 1 weight percent of a particular molecular group.

Q. Okay. And so that would be -- well, in any event, it's easier to target a specific area with XPS or EDS than it is for FTIR, correct?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. If you want to look at a specific area, you can target all the techniques with that, you can get more specificity with EDS than you can with XPS.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Here's a question I didn't ask.

On your FTIR, how did you target that? How did you target your FTIR readings?

A. It was really just wherever I could get a signal from the FTIR, so I moved the

crystal down in contact with the filament and -- to see if I got a signal or not.

Q. So that's the exact opposite of what you did for EDS, right?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. EDS allows me to identify where there's cracking and then do the EDS in that location.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. So if you thought there was biologic material in a certain portion of a monofilament, you didn't take that into account when you put the FTIR on?

A. You can't see it under the FTIR, rather like visually, the magnification is much too small to see that.

Q. But with your naked eye, you do conclude in these reports that it looked the same as the never-cleaned mesh -- right, never-implanted mesh?

A. I'm sorry?

Q. The cleaned, never-implanted mesh, that before you did the FTIR, to your naked eye they looked the same?

A. Visually, yes.

hydroxyl group is not indication of oxidation.
BY MR. BOWMAN:
Q. Okay. Well, that brings me back to the question.
So the fact that there is a nitrogen in the spectrum 32, that doesn't tell us that oxygen, or an OH is not bound to the surface of the polypropylene mesh, correct?
A. It could either be an OH bound to the surface of the polypropylene, which is the mechanism by which the secondary antioxidant stabilizes the polypropylene, or it could be through the presence of fatty acids.
Q. Or it could be oxidized polypropylene, couldn't it?
MR. PRATT: Object to the form.
A. You'd need to see carbonyls for that to be the case.
BY MR. BOWMAN:
Q. Well, again, you didn't do an FTIR on the sample where you did the EDS, right?
MR. PRATT: Object to the form.
A. No.
BY MR. BOWMAN:
Q. Right. Okay.

group?

A. There was trace amounts of amide groups present, but they're definitely greatly reduced compared to the first cleaning step.

Q. And you discuss and you say, "Based on the totality of my testing, the mesh was not oxidized," is that right?

A. That's correct.

Q. And again, you have some very -- the mesh -- there's a rather large piece of mesh, and you've performed two spot checks for nitrogen-based compounds by EDS, and that is enough data for you to conclude that the entire mesh was not oxidized?

A. That, coupled with the FTIR as well, which was done in two different locations, yes.

Q. And again, the EDS does not tell you whether or not there was carbon bound to the surface of the mesh, does it?

A. I don't understand your question.

Q. Certainly. I mean, if we look at the ratios of carbon oxygen here, this is by far -- the ratio here is .4 by weight of nitrogen, and then we have almost -- we have 4.9 percent by weight oxygen. And if we're talking about amide

groups, there has to be more nitrogen than that associated with the oxygen, correct?

A. Again, with two caveats on that. Quantitative EDS on these type of samples isn't a very good idea.

And the second caveat is because we have this aluminum present, that some of the oxygen is going to be associated with the aluminum.

Q. Okay. Taking into account those two caveats, we don't know if there are carbonyls present in the sample where you performed the EDS on the surface of the mesh?

A. There's nothing to suggest that there would be carbonyls here based on the FTIR and my experience with looking at these explants.

Q. Have you ruled it out?

A. Yes.

Q. Based on your experience, but not based on the data collected?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. Based on the data collected as well.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Even though the EDS is not the same spot where the FTIR was collected?

A. That's correct.

Q. And even though the EDS represents only a minute amount of the entire surface area of the mesh?

MR. PRATT: Object to the form.

A. It's replicative of what's happening in the other parts of the material. There's no reason why one spot would oxidize differently than another spot if it's going to oxidize.

BY MR. BOWMAN:

Q. Actually, there is a big reason why, and it's -- you've done work and I've seen your publications, and it's the fact that this material becomes induced, it's the surface induction of the polypropylene. You get the surface induction, huge reaction takes place, and then the induction begins all over again with the presence of oxygen bond to the surface, doesn't it, Doctor?

MR. PRATT: Wait. What's the question? You gave a speech, and I'm trying to figure out what the question is.

MR. BOWMAN: The question was; doesn't -- the doctor's answer was -- is there a way to read back the question?